National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVIII. NO. 20. NEW YORK, SATURDAY OCTOBER 3, 1857. WHOLE NO. 904.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

IN THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY HOUSE,

At the Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 North Fifth St., Philadelphia.

$3 PER ANNUM, in advance for each insertion.

EDDY & JOHNSTON, PRINTERS.

Pro-Slavery.

STATEMENT OF COL. NETHERLAND.

From The Knoxville (Tenn.) Presbyterian Witness.

Some weeks ago "A Statement" issued from your office, written by Samuel Sawyer. This statement was, as we say in your card, smuggled through your press, "through the misrepresentations and fraud of the author: and you will denominate it, in your card, as "an error and shamefully exaggerated publication." Unbiased, and shamefully exaggerated statements, I felt that it was for it is, in many of its material statements, I felt that it was for it is not so. Under this impression, I felt that the writer would let it go unnoticed by the Church for falsehood; whether it would be dealt with as the Church will do this or not remains to be seen.

I will briefly state the facts of this case, and [illegible] made the negro in question. I kept him in the county jail for his drunkenness, gambling and fighting, and caused me to sell him. He escaped from his owner, Mr. Blevins, in the fall of 1855.

He lay about from most of the winter, during which time he was harboured and fed in the Female College at this place (without the knowledge of the proper authorities) by day and night, by Anthony, a negro man in charge of the College. There was a large amount of mischief was done by this negro during the winter and spring of 1856 that was charged to him, and he was seen in sight of our town, and remained there concealed, fed and supported by other negroes in and about the place, until June, 1856.

He had shortly before I sold him, taken up with a free woman of this county, by whom he had no children, and soon after he took the woods, she took up with another free negro, and was perhaps married to him; and after living together awhile, they concluded to go to Ohio, and he went before them, and settled in the county in Ohio to stay a night with his grandmother. On returning to town next morning, they were waylaid by this negro, who was armed with a pistol and a large butcher knife; he attacked them, snapped one or two of the pistol near the negro man's face, the man to save his life; he followed him, and knocked him down with a stone, leaving him so disabled that he thought he could not get away; he then shot through the woman, and blew out her head with the pistol, using her to the skull in several places; then he tied her down and committed a rape upon her, and, leaving her tied, went to finish the negro man, telling her that he would cut her throat when he went and found his pocket-knife, which he had lost in the first attack; and further, that he intended to kill a negro man of mine, and another negro in the neighborhood, and then *he* would be satisfied. The woman untied herself and escaped to the house, and the man, having recovered from the blow with the stone, also escaped, and both came to town.

Many citizens of the town turned out to arrest the villain, but he escaped. There was much excitement in the town and county. This negro was known to every man that females in the neighborhood were afraid to pass from house to house. He made his escape; and being watched for on the road by a white man with his rifle, was ordered to stop, which he answered by presenting a pistol and swearing that he would kill the white man if he advanced on him. The white man drew his rifle and the negro ran and was shot, being hurt but slightly. He was pursued, and, again raising his pistol, he was shot and wounded twice, and yet made his escape, it being in the night. He then went to the next town, to the house of one of the most respectable ladies in the State, and was concealed in the cellar of the house, without her knowledge, for many months, in the town and near the street; the lady being in bad health and never going into the cellar, her servants were enabled to conceal him. His place of concealment was found, and he was taken and carried to jail. On the way he cut himself loose with a knife which he had concealed about him, and, being in the custody of but one man, who was afraid to attack him thus armed, he escaped into the woods. He then went some forty miles from that place, into the neighbourhood of Rogersville, where he dug himself another den, within two miles of my house and in sight of one of my farms. He was discovered by two negro men, both of whom were slaves of Mr. Hemphill, and, and anxious to have him arrested on account of his outrageous character and crime, and they informed a white man, who, in company with another white man, went to his den and arrested him, and brought him to Rogersville, and delivered him to Mr. Blevins, who had been his owner since the fall of 1855.

The place of his concealment was known to my negro Anthony, who had been employed about the Female College for a whole winter, which he could easily do, without being even suspected by the gentleman in charge of the College.

Having made many fruitless searches for this desperate negro, and knowing that Anthony knew where he was, Mr. Blevins believed that he could indnce Anthony to disclose Abe's place of concealment, by taking possession of him, and pretending to him that he had purchased him of Mr. Blevins, and sent him South in Abe's place, unless he told him where Abe was. I consented to this arrangement, and told Mr. Blevins further, that if he was obstinate and refused to tell, to whip and make him tell. He refused to do so; was whipped at Bean's Station by a severely; but still refused to tell. Mr. Blevins took him to; and, and the next morning, after receiving a few lashes with a switch, he told him where the negro was, and there the negro was found, showing conclusively that our previous information was correct, and that he knew all about him.

When I returned home and found that the negro was taken, I wished to know by whom he had been harboured, as I determined that, so far as my example and efforts could prevent it, that negroes of desperate character should not be concealed in my neighbourhood or in the female seminary of learning in Rogersville, and, as I know that no parent would permit his daughter to remain one hour in such a school, nor ought he to do it.

I said to Mr. Blevins, after we had tried to get from the negro his accomplices, and after he refused to give them, that he could not, and that he was villainous, and to make him tell who had been harbouring him. Mr. Blevins said he would do so. I went home to my farm having taken the negro with Mr. Blevins; and when he was whipped, I did not know it, nor was I within three miles of the place, and had nothing to do with either the manner or the amount of the punishment, but I approve of it fully, and the truth is that the punishment he received was not equal in severity to 39 lashes with a cowhide; the object being to frighten more than to hurt him. There was not as much blood drawn from this negro as Sawyer has drawn from white boys that he has whipped since he came to Rogersville.

As soon as this took place, Sawyer commenced, in the town and country, to make false and exaggerated statements, and, becoming excited himself, seemed to believe everybody else was equally so. He drew up and presented resolutions before the Session, and prepared charges against me as a member of the Church. This was done in my absence, and without any notice to me or to any but one member of the Church. When the proceeding began before the Session, one of its members spoke of its irregularity, and remarked that if the Session wished to know my connection with the punishment of the negro, that, if I was called on, I would voluntarily give them the information. Sawyer objected to this, and now complains that it was the very thing I refused to do, and what he wished done. So the matter ended in the Session, so far as I have any information. I was on my way to a court over forty miles from home, where I remained more than a week, and before my return had such was the feeling in the community that Sawyer had resigned as minister and said he would leave the country. After I had been at court several days, I was called on by Sawyer, who said he wanted to see me about the negro case, and told me that the resolution introduced by him in the Session had no reference to me, that he had not prepared or preferred any charge against me, and that he never had any intention of doing so. I recounted over to him several of his falsehoods, in relation to the matter, of which there is undoubted proof. The conversation closed by his saying that he would leave the country, that he would not trouble any one long. My answer was that he never would do any good in any place until he would have more regard for truth, and so we parted. The next thing I see from him is his "Statement to the Public," in which a great lamentation is made over Anthony, who is, in the eye of Sawyer, worthy to have his virtues put on record by him and his brother Abolitionists. He represents him as having been my nurse, a member of the same Church with me, a gray-headed old servant, "dutiful and exemplary." Anthony has some notoriety in this region; he refused, without any cause, to live with his master who raised him from childhood; he was, at his own request, sold, and sold, as one lived in a cotton region, he wanted to return to it; the owners of his wife and children bought him from the trader and kept him as long as his conduct would permit them, then sold him and his wife and children to a gentleman of this County; he ran away from him, was taken and sold to another trader, who promised to take him out of the country, but sold him to another gentleman in half a mile of the first seller. He kept him until his conduct forced him to sell him to another trader, who was bound by his contract to keep him confined until he left the country, and then take him three hundred miles before he would sell him, as the gentleman who had purchased him of the second trader believed that he would burn some of his buildings. He was taken and put in jail, and, while there, procured a letter to be written to me to buy him.

I, as a matter of feeling, went to the owners and gave them the letter, and, not wishing to buy the negro, which was to gratify him, then went to the gentleman who had bonnd them to take him out of the county and at my request he released them from [illegible] because the government of Great Britain had no right to interfere with what was an undeniable usurpation in a foreign kingdom, that the government of the United States had no right, and were not bound to interpose, and put down, in one of their own Territories, a ruffian usurpation from Missouri?

In respect to France, there was reason enough why other nations, for purposes of *national* intercourse, should recognise its present government as a *de facto* power. But what was that to the Constitution of the United States the supreme law of the land? Has not our Government the right to authorize and regulate the Government of its own territories? Does not the power of Congress to govern Territories carry with it the right and the duty which arises from it? If this Government owes any duty whatever to the country, is it not most sacredly bound to protect freedom and free institutions in the Territories, and to put down, in one of their own Territories, a ruffian usurpation from Missouri?

Your memorialists again ask, whether a case can well be imagined, to which the name of authoritative government could be applied with more palpable impropriety and untruth, than to the Territorial Government of Kansas? Without any pretence of political shamelessness blush to call it by such a name? Was not the true and only character of this Government known to you and the whole country before your inauguration, and before the Senate's assent to your nomination, and with the full knowledge of it, accept your nomination, which you were free to decline, and thus avoid the responsibility of executing these nefarious laws; or, did you suppose the rights of office would exempt you from this responsibility? You admit the Constitutional duty of the President to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." And now, without holding you responsible for any acts of your predecessor, for which you are not willing to be responsible and have not fully sanctioned, your memorialists would ask, was there no law to be taken care of, by preventing a well-known projected invasion of the polls and the legislature of the Territory, and by the like care of afterward by expelling the invaders from the Territory—no law to be taken care of in respect to the thefts, the robbery, the murders, and the numerous acts of violence that [illegible] The British, as a government, had no right of question or of control in the matter—though very conscientious! *I verily thought that I ought,* &c.

Earnestness and zeal, if not governed by truth, becomes furious; and so much more mischievous than the evils they propose to exterminate. We may say that all mainly of the evil of this agitation has come of—EXTREMES. A SPIRIT EXTREMELY INTOLERANT AND RESISTIVE ON BOTH SIDES of Mason and Dixon's line; I wish there was no such line!

Selections.

THE NEW HAVEN MEMORIALISTS IN REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT.

From The New Haven Daily Palladium, September 22, 1857.

To his Excellency, JAMES BUCHANAN, *President of the United States:*

In July last, a number of citizens of Connecticut addressed to you, as Chief Magistrate of this nation, a memorial on the affairs of Kansas. To this you replied, under date of Aug. 15, 1857, in a manner which does not, your memorialists understood, to some extent, the ground taken by the memorialists, for we would not impute to you the intention to misrepresent them. As you have thought proper to lay the memorial and reply before the public, your memorialists deem it due to have conferred on the subject, and have felt themselves compelled again to address you. We would remark, then, that the main facts alleged in that memorial are either passed over without denial or are virtually admitted, or cannot be.

These facts are two: First, "that the fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States and of our political institutions is that the people shall make their own laws, and order their own affairs." Secondly, "that Governor Walker of Kansas openly represents and proclaims that the President of the United States is employing, through him (Walker), an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws which are not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made and rulers they never elected." As to these two facts, the people have been left in no uncertainty as to which chiefly require vindication from you, they say that they find no denial of them in your reply. They do not say that you have attempted no vindication of your acts and doings through the Senate; but only that they can find in your reply no plain or explicit denial of the facts referred to—not even what they consider the shadow of a denial.

The facts stand in the Memorial, then, uncontradicted, by what you evidently consider a triumphant reply. Why is this? Are these assertions, on which the whole subject at issue depends, untrue—and yet no denial of them—not a word to prove them untrue? Without such denial, how can you regard the memorialists and the country to believe and to say? What, but that the facts which they allege are notorious and undeniable?

As to the allegation respecting the fundamental principle of the Constitution, your memorialists hope that the time is remote when the enlightened citizens of this country will deny that principle; though party zeal, in its infatuation, may one day trample it in the dust, when, in sight of the ruin, Liberty and Religion, in exile, will together bend and hold in his hand when he spoke.

7. "It is a delusion and a lie" when Sawyer seeks to make the impression that any such doctrine prevails in the South, but is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory, in their view, it is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory. Such a false doctrine for him (as easily as Mrs. Cunningham was furnished with a false heir, by a Doctor equally convenient and accommodating, in New York.)

8. It is untrue that any leader of the South has said that "the Union ought to be preserved at the cost of his own conscience to prevent it from being overturned by force; in the language of the Constitution, "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed!" You then add: "It was for this purpose that Governor Walker was sent to Kansas, to act as a conservator *cum status* in aiding the civil magistrates to carry the law into execution." Here, then, is the distinct admission and declaration, on your part, that you ordered a military force to be raised in the Territory, to act in support of its territorial government, and of enforcing its territorial laws. So far, then, in respect to one matter of fact, you admit the assertion of your memorialists.

Your vindication, therefore, rests upon the assertion that there was, in fact, a government in Kansas—such a government as it was your duty to sustain. The essential question on which the whole controversy turns is thus raised; it is simply this: Was there a government, or were there laws in Kansas, in a just, proper and authorized meaning of the language, "when you entered upon the duties of the Presidential office on the 4th of March last?"

If this can be proved to be true, your memorialists will know something which they have yet to learn. If it can be proved not to be true, "it will present a memorable example of the truth that political prejudice is blind even to the existence of the plainest and most palpable of historical facts." Nor is this all. It will show that you ordered an army to Kansas to sustain a so-called government which is not a government, and laws which are not laws.

Here your memorialists take the position that nothing can be truly government or law which has no authority; and that nothing should be treated as government or law which proves to be destitute of authority.

It may gratify them to know my treatment of negroes and what rights I claim over them as master. I have never whipped a grown negro in my life, though I have owned them ever since I was twenty-one years old. I claim the right and will exercise it to make any negro or mine arrest a runaway of bad character, and I do not own one that would refuse to do it; and if any one of these Abolitionists wish to make my acquaintance, I will be most happy to accommodate them, and to publish any of their inflammatory papers, calculated to excite our slaves—if any negro of mine, not even excepting Anthony, will refuse to cowhide him, he may take him to my farm.

I have no desire to satisfy Abolitionists, having a contempt for the whole of that class of fanatics, nor am I of the number that believe there are no men of candour and intelligence at the North; on the contrary, my experience is that there are many men among them who have proper information, who condemn and denounce these fanatics, and for such I have respect.

Yours respectfully, JNO. NETHERLAND.

DR. COX ON AGITATORS.

[In the *Genesee Evangelist*, the Rev. Dr. Cox is speaking of the Abolition agitation in the last General Assembly, and thus speaks of the late Richmond Convention and its members.]

I AM not about to praise my brethren, who have been busy with this new quickly at Richmond. The wisdom of *the man of Koss*, his metaphysics, his dialectics, and his tactics, may be none the wisest and the best. Even Dr. Newton, Dr. Boyd, Dr. Reed, and other excellent brethren, may not be right, as they are not practically wise and calm and patient, as we could wish they were. But—a question remains! If they err, are we all innocent in the pre-disposing cause? Have we given them no occasion? Are they fears all ridiculous or gratuitous? Nay, have not we, and our *goodish* agitators, year after year continually, goaded them, pestered them, injured them, slandered them, wilfully dishonoured them, till they HAD TO DO something? Have we possibly found out the best thing and the wisest, after all. As said the venerable and excellent Dr. Hill—I heard him say it years ago, in the General Assembly, with tenderness and tears—"when we do come to see the best man that ever lived, always on his knees begs on us!" He is now in heaven.

However figurative was his rhetoric, it has a meaning. Some of our worst barkers have even been the men of rabid zeal canine, who forget that not zeal, but—WISDOM is profitable to direct. And these—*they* could not be the agitators. Zeal and partisan nose-counts were with them about all of it. They forgot the Constitution, forgot the nature of the Kingdom of Christ, forgot the plain facts of Scripture and its teachings, forgot common sense—all for zeal and the Presidential election! And with how many this earthly fretlan is better than the Gospel!

With them, as some of us *well* know, to talk of Scripture, or wisdom, or apostolic usage, especially when we are so cruel as to prove it, is to be an old fogy, a coward, a doomed "conservative," and an enemy to all proper reforms. If a man dares to think for himself he runs a close caste; to lose, impeached, suspected, villified—hence many, who might rather lead, only follow, like rotten wood afloat on the freshet, *whithersoever the governor listeth.* They acquiesce, and confirm the peace and similarity—while their sober convictions are coerced or crushed in the contest. Indeed, one often fears to be misrepresented, and fears it too much. The class to whom we give leaders and agitators, are not very generous in their inferences and constructions. They, and what they think, are the only standard of rectitude with them. To differ from them is the demonstration of sin; the indictment, the evidence, the verdict, the sentence and almost its execution too. For example, by what rule do they slander a ministerial brother as pro-slavery, and call him such—with a view to render him infamous? Is it not that he dares to think for himself, and not very coarse? So really it seems to me. Well I know that the epithet is generally false, and only false. Yet must one be bound to run after the libel, and try to kill it, before it loses breath and dies of itself? Is there no such thing as a man's being misunderstood, to some extent, the ground taken by the memorialists, for we would not impute to you the by many this earthly fretlan is better than the Gospel!

Selections.

THE NEW HAVEN MEMORIALISTS IN REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT.

From The New Haven Daily Palladium, September 22, 1857.

To his Excellency, JAMES BUCHANAN, *President of the United States:*

In July last, a number of citizens of Connecticut addressed to you, as Chief Magistrate of this nation, a memorial on the affairs of Kansas. To this you replied, under date of Aug. 15, 1857, in a manner which does not, your memorialists understood, to some extent, the ground taken by the memorialists, for we would not impute to you the intention to misrepresent them. As you have thought proper to lay the memorial and reply before the public, your memorialists deem it due to have conferred on the subject, and have felt themselves compelled again to address you. We would remark, then, that the main facts alleged in that memorial are either passed over without denial or are virtually admitted, or cannot be.

These facts are two: First, "that the fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States and of our political institutions is that the people shall make their own laws, and order their own affairs." Secondly, "that Governor Walker of Kansas openly represents and proclaims that the President of the United States is employing, through him (Walker), an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws which are not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made and rulers they never elected." As to these two facts, the people have been left in no uncertainty as to which chiefly require vindication from you, they say that they find no denial of them in your reply. They do not say that you have attempted no vindication of your acts and doings through the Senate; but only that they can find in your reply no plain or explicit denial of the facts referred to—not even what they consider the shadow of a denial.

The facts stand in the Memorial, then, uncontradicted, by what you evidently consider a triumphant reply. Why is this? Are these assertions, on which the whole subject at issue depends, untrue—and yet no denial of them—not a word to prove them untrue? Without such denial, how can you regard the memorialists and the country to believe and to say? What, but that the facts which they allege are notorious and undeniable?

As to the allegation respecting the fundamental principle of the Constitution, your memorialists hope that the time is remote when the enlightened citizens of this country will deny that principle; though party zeal, in its infatuation, may one day trample it in the dust, when, in sight of the ruin, Liberty and Religion, in exile, will together bend and hold in his hand when he spoke.

7. "It is a delusion and a lie" when Sawyer seeks to make the impression that any such doctrine prevails in the South, but is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory, in their view, it is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory. Such a false doctrine for him (as easily as Mrs. Cunningham was furnished with a false heir, by a Doctor equally convenient and accommodating, in New York.)

8. It is untrue that any leader of the South has said that "the Union ought to be preserved at the cost of his own conscience to prevent it from being overturned by force; in the language of the Constitution, "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed!" You then add: "It was for this purpose that Governor Walker was sent to Kansas, to act as a conservator *cum status* in aiding the civil magistrates to carry the law into execution." Here, then, is the distinct admission and declaration, on your part, that you ordered a military force to be raised in the Territory, to act in support of its territorial government, and of enforcing its territorial laws. So far, then, in respect to one matter of fact, you admit the assertion of your memorialists.

Your vindication, therefore, rests upon the assertion that there was, in fact, a government in Kansas—such a government as it was your duty to sustain. The essential question on which the whole controversy turns is thus raised; it is simply this: Was there a government, or were there laws in Kansas, in a just, proper and authorized meaning of the language, "when you entered upon the duties of the Presidential office on the 4th of March last?"

If this can be proved to be true, your memorialists will know something which they have yet to learn. If it can be proved not to be true, "it will present a memorable example of the truth that political prejudice is blind even to the existence of the plainest and most palpable of historical facts." Nor is this all. It will show that you ordered an army to Kansas to sustain a so-called government which is not a government, and laws which are not laws.

Here your memorialists take the position that nothing can be truly government or law which has no authority; and that nothing should be treated as government or law which proves to be destitute of authority.

Can anything which tramples under foot all human rights, and is a known outrage upon our Constitution and our political institutions, whatever be its name or form, be justly regarded as government or law by the people of Connecticut and the free States? Can an outrage be clothed with authority by a President, Senate, Congress, or a whole Congress of Presidents? Can usurpation beget a valid government or law, or impart a right to govern, which the people are bound to obey? It might may make it a matter of prudence to avoid its wrath by submission, but can usurpation create an obligation to obey when none exists?

Suppose the Governor, or any other tyrant, had established the same so-called government and laws of Kansas, by the same means by which, as all the world knows, they were established—by invasion and arms; would any citizen of the United States call them "government and laws," except in derision and with loathing? Is a bogus government government? Are bogus laws laws? Is this "government established," and are these "laws enacted," and yet known to possess no other or higher authority than that derived from border ruffians? Are "We, the people of the United States," to be stultified into the belief of such a dogma! For that result, wait at least for the more absolute dominion of a tyrant.

Your memorialists will now present what they consider the fundamental error of your reply. In their view, in recognising the territorial government and laws of Kansas as a genuine government and valid laws, you have perverted the general principle upon which you rest your vindication, and have violated its essential spirit and meaning.

That general principle may be thus stated: When rules of action, claiming to be valid laws, present on the first aspect evidence that they proceed from a rightful law-making power, it is the duty of the people and executors of law to recognise them as authoritative. To this, as a general principle, your memorialists subscribe. It is the only means of securing obedience to the law, and of preventing violence and anarchy. Nor do they yield to my man or class of men a higher estimate of its importance, or a firmer determination to adopt and defend it, than themselves. But to say that all governments and all laws claiming to be valid must be recognised, executed and obeyed as such, is as preposterous as to deny the general principle itself. To mistake the general rule for an universal rule, the conditional for an unconditional principle, must lead to false reasoning and to practical conclusions of the most dangerous character. This, in the view of your memorialists, who believe that none are too wise or good to err, is what you (they trust inadvertently) have done.

In considering the territorial government and laws as authoritative, have you not violated the whole spirit and meaning of the general principle laid down? Have you not wholly disregarded the essential condition, that the only government which it is your duty to sanction must present some evidence of rightful authority? You recognise the territorial laws as valid. What is this but to act upon the principle that, when such so-called government and laws are presented before you, without the shadow of evidence of their proceeding from a rightful law-making power, but with the most decisive and overwhelming proof that they have originated in a palpable and notorious usurpation, that even then, even in a case so flagrant, it is your duty to sustain and execute them, even by the armies of the United States?

Your memorialists are here anxious to call your attention to a single fact, and one of distinction, which you appear entirely to overlook. They readily concede that, in case of no consequent occurrence, one government may properly recognise another as authoritative, or as a government de facto, though in very low degree of evidence, without rightly investigating its authority, or even considering its origin. For example, the government of Great Britain, when Louis Napoleon was enthroned in France by a bloody usurpation, and with the most palpable absence of the consent of the people, at first refused to recognise him as the ruler of that nation. The British, as a government, had no right of question or of control in the matter—though very conscientious! *I verily thought that I ought,* &c.

Earnestness and zeal, if not governed by truth, becomes furious; and so much more mischievous than the evils they propose to exterminate. We may say that all mainly of the evil of this agitation has come of—EXTREMES. A SPIRIT EXTREMELY INTOLERANT AND RESISTIVE ON BOTH SIDES of Mason and Dixon's line; I wish there was no such line!

Selections.

THE NEW HAVEN MEMORIALISTS IN REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT.

From The New Haven Daily Palladium, September 22, 1857.

To his Excellency, JAMES BUCHANAN, *President of the United States:*

In July last, a number of citizens of Connecticut addressed to you, as Chief Magistrate of this nation, a memorial on the affairs of Kansas. To this you replied, under date of Aug. 15, 1857, in a manner which does not, your memorialists understood, to some extent, the ground taken by the memorialists, for we would not impute to you the intention to misrepresent them. As you have thought proper to lay the memorial and reply before the public, your memorialists deem it due to have conferred on the subject, and have felt themselves compelled again to address you. We would remark, then, that the main facts alleged in that memorial are either passed over without denial or are virtually admitted, or cannot be.

These facts are two: First, "that the fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States and of our political institutions is that the people shall make their own laws, and order their own affairs." Secondly, "that Governor Walker of Kansas openly represents and proclaims that the President of the United States is employing, through him (Walker), an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws which are not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made and rulers they never elected." As to these two facts, the people have been left in no uncertainty as to which chiefly require vindication from you, they say that they find no denial of them in your reply. They do not say that you have attempted no vindication of your acts and doings through the Senate; but only that they can find in your reply no plain or explicit denial of the facts referred to—not even what they consider the shadow of a denial.

The facts stand in the Memorial, then, uncontradicted, by what you evidently consider a triumphant reply. Why is this? Are these assertions, on which the whole subject at issue depends, untrue—and yet no denial of them—not a word to prove them untrue? Without such denial, how can you regard the memorialists and the country to believe and to say? What, but that the facts which they allege are notorious and undeniable?

As to the allegation respecting the fundamental principle of the Constitution, your memorialists hope that the time is remote when the enlightened citizens of this country will deny that principle; though party zeal, in its infatuation, may one day trample it in the dust, when, in sight of the ruin, Liberty and Religion, in exile, will together bend and hold in his hand when he spoke.

7. "It is a delusion and a lie" when Sawyer seeks to make the impression that any such doctrine prevails in the South, but is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory, in their view, it is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory. Such a false doctrine for him (as easily as Mrs. Cunningham was furnished with a false heir, by a Doctor equally convenient and accommodating, in New York.)

8. It is untrue that any leader of the South has said that "the Union ought to be preserved at the cost of his own conscience to prevent it from being overturned by force; in the language of the Constitution, "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed!" You then add: "It was for this purpose that Governor Walker was sent to Kansas, to act as a conservator *cum status* in aiding the civil magistrates to carry the law into execution." Here, then, is the distinct admission and declaration, on your part, that you ordered a military force to be raised in the Territory, to act in support of its territorial government, and of enforcing its territorial laws. So far, then, in respect to one matter of fact, you admit the assertion of your memorialists.

Your vindication, therefore, rests upon the assertion that there was, in fact, a government in Kansas—such a government as it was your duty to sustain. The essential question on which the whole controversy turns is thus raised; it is simply this: Was there a government, or were there laws in Kansas, in a just, proper and authorized meaning of the language, "when you entered upon the duties of the Presidential office on the 4th of March last?"

If this can be proved to be true, your memorialists will know something which they have yet to learn. If it can be proved not to be true, "it will present a memorable example of the truth that political prejudice is blind even to the existence of the plainest and most palpable of historical facts." Nor is this all. It will show that you ordered an army to Kansas to sustain a so-called government which is not a government, and laws which are not laws.

Here your memorialists take the position that nothing can be truly government or law which has no authority; and that nothing should be treated as government or law which proves to be destitute of authority.

Can anything which tramples under foot all human rights, and is a known outrage upon our Constitution and our political institutions, whatever be its name or form, be justly regarded as government or law by the people of Connecticut and the free States? Can an outrage be clothed with authority by a President, Senate, Congress, or a whole Congress of Presidents? Can usurpation beget a valid government or law, or impart a right to govern, which the people are bound to obey? It might may make it a matter of prudence to avoid its wrath by submission, but can usurpation create an obligation to obey when none exists?

Suppose the Governor, or any other tyrant, had established the same so-called government and laws of Kansas, by the same means by which, as all the world knows, they were established—by invasion and arms; would any citizen of the United States call them "government and laws," except in derision and with loathing? Is a bogus government government? Are bogus laws laws? Is this "government established," and are these "laws enacted," and yet known to possess no other or higher authority than that derived from border ruffians? Are "We, the people of the United States," to be stultified into the belief of such a dogma! For that result, wait at least for the more absolute dominion of a tyrant.

Your memorialists will now present what they consider the fundamental error of your reply. In their view, in recognising the territorial government and laws of Kansas as a genuine government and valid laws, you have perverted the general principle upon which you rest your vindication, and have violated its essential spirit and meaning.

That general principle may be thus stated: When rules of action, claiming to be valid laws, present on the first aspect evidence that they proceed from a rightful law-making power, it is the duty of the people and executors of law to recognise them as authoritative. To this, as a general principle, your memorialists subscribe. It is the only means of securing obedience to the law, and of preventing violence and anarchy. Nor do they yield to my man or class of men a higher estimate of its importance, or a firmer determination to adopt and defend it, than themselves. But to say that all governments and all laws claiming to be valid must be recognised, executed and obeyed as such, is as preposterous as to deny the general principle itself. To mistake the general rule for an universal rule, the conditional for an unconditional principle, must lead to false reasoning and to practical conclusions of the most dangerous character. This, in the view of your memorialists, who believe that none are too wise or good to err, is what you (they trust inadvertently) have done.

In considering the territorial government and laws as authoritative, have you not violated the whole spirit and meaning of the general principle laid down? Have you not wholly disregarded the essential condition, that the only government which it is your duty to sanction must present some evidence of rightful authority? You recognise the territorial laws as valid. What is this but to act upon the principle that, when such so-called government and laws are presented before you, without the shadow of evidence of their proceeding from a rightful law-making power, but with the most decisive and overwhelming proof that they have originated in a palpable and notorious usurpation, that even then, even in a case so flagrant, it is your duty to sustain and execute them, even by the armies of the United States?

Your memorialists are here anxious to call your attention to a single fact, and one of distinction, which you appear entirely to overlook. They readily concede that, in case of no consequent occurrence, one government may properly recognise another as authoritative, or as a government de facto, though in very low degree of evidence, without rightly investigating its authority, or even considering its origin. For example, the government of Great Britain, when Louis Napoleon was enthroned in France by a bloody usurpation, and with the most palpable absence of the consent of the people, at first refused to recognise him as the ruler of that nation. The British, as a government, had no right of question or of control in the matter—though very conscientious! *I verily thought that I ought,* &c.

Earnestness and zeal, if not governed by truth, becomes furious; and so much more mischievous than the evils they propose to exterminate. We may say that all mainly of the evil of this agitation has come of—EXTREMES. A SPIRIT EXTREMELY INTOLERANT AND RESISTIVE ON BOTH SIDES of Mason and Dixon's line; I wish there was no such line!

Selections.

THE NEW HAVEN MEMORIALISTS IN REPLY TO THE PRESIDENT.

From The New Haven Daily Palladium, September 22, 1857.

To his Excellency, JAMES BUCHANAN, *President of the United States:*

In July last, a number of citizens of Connecticut addressed to you, as Chief Magistrate of this nation, a memorial on the affairs of Kansas. To this you replied, under date of Aug. 15, 1857, in a manner which does not, your memorialists understood, to some extent, the ground taken by the memorialists, for we would not impute to you the intention to misrepresent them. As you have thought proper to lay the memorial and reply before the public, your memorialists deem it due to have conferred on the subject, and have felt themselves compelled again to address you. We would remark, then, that the main facts alleged in that memorial are either passed over without denial or are virtually admitted, or cannot be.

These facts are two: First, "that the fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States and of our political institutions is that the people shall make their own laws, and order their own affairs." Secondly, "that Governor Walker of Kansas openly represents and proclaims that the President of the United States is employing, through him (Walker), an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws which are not their own, nor of the United States; but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made and rulers they never elected." As to these two facts, the people have been left in no uncertainty as to which chiefly require vindication from you, they say that they find no denial of them in your reply. They do not say that you have attempted no vindication of your acts and doings through the Senate; but only that they can find in your reply no plain or explicit denial of the facts referred to—not even what they consider the shadow of a denial.

The facts stand in the Memorial, then, uncontradicted, by what you evidently consider a triumphant reply. Why is this? Are these assertions, on which the whole subject at issue depends, untrue—and yet no denial of them—not a word to prove them untrue? Without such denial, how can you regard the memorialists and the country to believe and to say? What, but that the facts which they allege are notorious and undeniable?

As to the allegation respecting the fundamental principle of the Constitution, your memorialists hope that the time is remote when the enlightened citizens of this country will deny that principle; though party zeal, in its infatuation, may one day trample it in the dust, when, in sight of the ruin, Liberty and Religion, in exile, will together bend and hold in his hand when he spoke.

7. "It is a delusion and a lie" when Sawyer seeks to make the impression that any such doctrine prevails in the South, but is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory, in their view, it is entirely groundless and unsatisfactory. Such a false doctrine for him (as easily as Mrs. Cunningham was furnished with a false heir, by a Doctor equally convenient and accommodating, in New York.)

8. It is untrue that any leader of the South has said that "the Union ought to be preserved at the cost of his own conscience to prevent it from being overturned by force; in the language of the Constitution, "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed!" You then add: "It was for this purpose that Governor Walker was sent to Kansas, to act as a conservator *cum status* in aiding the civil magistrates to carry the law into execution." Here, then, is the distinct admission and declaration, on your part, that you ordered a military force to be raised in the Territory, to act in support of its territorial government, and of enforcing its territorial laws. So far, then, in respect to one matter of fact, you admit the assertion of your memorialists.

Your vindication, therefore, rests upon the assertion that there was, in fact, a government in Kansas—such a government as it was your duty to sustain. The essential question on which the whole controversy turns is thus raised; it is simply this: Was there a government, or were there laws in Kansas, in a just, proper and authorized meaning of the language, "when you entered upon the duties of the Presidential office on the 4th of March last?"

If this can be proved to be true, your memorialists will know something which they have yet to learn. If it can be proved not to be true, "it will present a memorable example of the truth that political prejudice is blind even to the existence of the plainest and most palpable of historical facts." Nor is this all. It will show that you ordered an army to Kansas to sustain a so-called government which is not a government, and laws which are not laws.

Here your memorialists take the position that nothing can be truly government or law which has no authority; and that nothing should be treated as government or law which proves to be destitute of authority.

Can anything which tramples under foot all human rights, and is a known outrage upon our Constitution and our political institutions, whatever be its name or form, be justly regarded as government or law by the people of Connecticut and the free States? Can an outrage be clothed with authority by a President, Senate, Congress, or a whole Congress of Presidents? Can usurpation beget a valid government or law, or impart a right to govern, which the people are bound to obey? It might may make it a matter of prudence to avoid its wrath by submission, but can usurpation create an obligation to obey when none exists?

Suppose the Governor, or any other tyrant, had established the same so-called government and laws of Kansas, by the same means by which, as all the world knows, they were established—by invasion and arms; would any citizen of the United States call them "government and laws," except in derision and with loathing? Is a bogus government government? Are bogus laws laws? Is this "government established," and are these "laws enacted," and yet known to possess no other or higher authority than that derived from border ruffians? Are "We, the people of the United States," to be stultified into the belief of such a dogma! For that result, wait at least for the more absolute dominion of a tyrant.

Your memorialists will now present what they consider the fundamental error of your reply. In their view, in recognising the territorial government and laws of Kansas as a genuine government and valid laws, you have perverted the general principle upon which you rest your vindication, and have violated its essential spirit and meaning.

That general principle may be thus stated: When rules of action, claiming to be valid laws, present on the first aspect evidence that they proceed from a rightful law-making power, it is the duty of the people and executors of law to recognise them as authoritative. To this, as a general principle, your memorialists subscribe. It is the only means of securing obedience to the law, and of preventing violence and anarchy. Nor do they yield to my man or class of men a higher estimate of its importance, or a firmer determination to adopt and defend it, than themselves. But to say that all governments and all laws claiming to be valid must be recognised, executed and obeyed as such, is as preposterous as to deny the general principle itself. To mistake the general rule for an universal rule, the conditional for an unconditional principle, must lead to false reasoning and to practical conclusions of the most dangerous character. This, in the view of your memorialists, who believe that none are too wise or good to err, is what you (they trust inadvertently) have done.

In considering the territorial government and laws as authoritative, have you not violated the whole spirit and meaning of the general principle laid down? Have you not wholly disregarded the essential condition, that the only government which it is your duty to sanction must present some evidence of rightful authority? You recognise the territorial laws as valid. What is this but to act upon the principle that, when such so-called government and laws are presented before you, without the shadow of evidence of their proceeding from a rightful law-making power, but with the most decisive and overwhelming proof that they have originated in a palpable and notorious usurpation, that even then, even in a case so flagrant, it is your duty to sustain and execute them, even by the armies of the United States?

Your memorialists are here anxious to call your attention to a single fact, and one of distinction, which you appear entirely to overlook. They readily concede that, in case of no consequent occurrence, one government may properly recognise another as authoritative, or as a government de facto, though in very low degree of evidence, without rightly investigating its authority, or even considering its origin. For example, the government of Great Britain, when Louis Napoleon was enthroned in France by a bloody usurpation, and with the most palpable absence of the consent of the people, at first refused to recognise him as the ruler of that nation. The British, as a government, had no right of question or of control in the matter—though very conscientious! *I verily thought that I ought,* &c

is no hope of rescue, but in the united mass of Democratic Republicans.

It is darkest just before dawn. This is the darkest hour of the night. Never before has a doctrine been proclaimed, which not only no European nation, but no nation of Christendom, save only Brazil and our own, would now maintain. The disgrace has fallen upon us through our supineness and our divisions. Let us be supine no longer, and let us lay aside all minor divisions, that we may redeem our country, the country of our freedom-loving forefathers, from that curse, greater than slavery—that libel of degrading and extending it.

The condition of Kansas demands your most attentive consideration. You see there the fruits of that policy of which the present National Administration is the defender and promoter—a country opened to slavery that slavery might be sure to enter; a Legislature elected by slaveholders, who did not live on the soil; and making laws which no freeman could bear; this Legislature and these laws upheld by the President and Congress; and the President now enforcing them, because he says he has no dispensing power. But how does it happen that this misfeasance and these laws exist? Who are responsible for them? Who called them into being? The party which now has control of the General Government; the party against which we contend; the party which seeks to carry the State of New York at the coming election; and which would be emboldened to reopen the slave trade, if it could succeed in bearing down the Democratic Republicans.

While we say this, we have said enough to satisfy every friend of freedom, and every lover of good government, that our success now is scarcely less important than it was at the last Presidential election. If we can hope ever to retrieve the losses which freedom has sustained, and is constantly sustaining, we must stand firm now, and show the State of New York as the irremovable bulwark against the slaveholders' domination.

Citizens of the State of New York, fellow-electors, the choice is before you. You are to determine whether the State shall be governed by a party calling itself Democratic, which believes in the inequality of men and the right of one to hold and sell another, and which, in that part of the State now under its control, presents the worst instance of misgovernment which this country ever beheld; or by the Democratic Republicans, who believe in the equality of men before the law; in the inalienable rights of every human being; and in a free but firm government; in the economical administration of affairs; and who will strive to secure the purity of the elective franchise and the purity of legislation.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolved, That the Democratic Republican party of the State of New York adhere with inflexible firmness to the doctrines of the founders of the Republic; that the true end of government is the protection of human rights, and the test of n just administration the extent to which it carries that doctrine into practice.

Resolved, That it is a contradiction of terms to call that party a Democrat who believes the right of one man to enslave another; or to designate that a Democratic Government which carries slavery wherever it goes.

Resolved, That the opinions of the majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Dred Scott, and the letter of the President to the memorial of clergymen on the affairs of Kansas, contain doctrines to which the people of this State will never assent, be the consequences what they may.

THE PIOUS SLAVE-TORTURER, OF ROGERSVILLE.

From The Tribune.

DEACON COLONEL JOHN Netherland of Tennessee, who figured more conspicuously and creditably in the Missionary events which have given so much fame to the before obscure town of Rogersville, in that State, has published a long statement of the affair, in which the fact most conspicuously appears that Colonel John Netherland is in a very bad humour. He permits his angry passions to rise to the height of calling us "a graceless scoundrel who, if he had the opportunity, would sell his Saviour for less than Judas did, and who, being a man-stealing deacon or a baby-vending Church-member, we do not know what wickedness we might be betrayed into; but if Netherland will only promise not to pray for us, we hope to escape any crying iniquity. And if the Great Teacher to whom Netherland so strangely refers us should ever appear in the flesh, we think that he would be much safer from sale or even from scourging in New York than in Rogersville.

The kind of Netherland's statement is that the Rev. Samuel Sawyer is a liar. We have a succession of point-blank contradictions. For instance, the boy Abe was not flogged at all severely, his blows, in the opinion of Deacon John, being absolutely and deliberately careless in comparison with those which should have been administered. Now we must tell Netherland very plainly that we do not believe him and we do believe Sawyer, not as the Deacon may think because we are prejudiced, but simply because it is not reasonable to suppose that a clergyman who had been comfortably settled for a period of years over a Church, and who must have known that falsehood would have been fatal to any instant exposure, would gratuitously have gone to work and invented such a tale. The presumptions are all the other way. He would be more likely instead of exaggerating to extenuate the cruelties. He was writing of events of which all his neighbours were cognizant, and which must have been mad to have devised a roorback which so many people were in a position to refute. Then, on the other hand, Netherland says distinctly that he was not present either at the whole or the half of the flogging, and that he is only showing he is not a competent witness. But by his own confession it appears that he did deliver up his own slave to be tortured by brainer Blevins, and that he did incite that merchant of men to diminish Abe's fare.

The Deacon justifies the flogging by saying that Abe ran away, that he was a bad boy, that he was intemperate, that he was this, that and the other. What seems to have been his great crime—greater in the opinion of Netherland than even the rape which this Abe is charged with committing upon the person of his own wife—is, that once having run away, he refused to come back again. He even had the audacity to take shelter in a female college. So successful was he in evading pursuit for a short time concealed by the neighbours, white and black, which affords pretty good evidence that he was popular among them. The Deacon avers that he sold Abe to Blevins because his character was bad. But for what? For being stubborn under the lash? Abe cannot speak for himself, and we certainly shall not take Netherland's word as to his character.

Concerning the flogging administered to Anthony, for refusing to disclose Abe's place of concealment, we have the distinct admission of Netherland himself that he did surrender Anthony to Blevins, the slave-trader, in order that the secrets of Abe's concealment might be flogged out of him. He also adds that Anthony was flogged at Bean's Station "very severely." These are Netherland's own words. He admits that Anthony received two distinct floggings, one at the station and the other at the jail. This concedes what Sawyer asserts. Indeed, the general effect of Netherland's letter is to strengthen our belief in the truth of all that was important in the first narration. We have the fact of both floggings admitted, and also the fact that Netherland refused to do one and advised the other. One of these castigations, he says, was "very severe," and we have the testimony of eye-witnesses to the enmity of the second.

Moreover, if Netherland's manifesto did not contain these admissions, we find enough in it, upon his own showing, to impeach his character for truth and veracity. In the following sentence he admits that he assisted in the invention of a lie, and instigated and encouraged another to utter it:

"During many fruitless searches for this desperate negro, and knowing that Anthony knew where he was, Blevins begged at that he could induce Anthony to disclose Abe's place of concealment, by taking pocket-knife of him, and pretending to him that he had purchased him, and he would not have him scourged, but that unless he told him where Abe was, I consented to this arrangement."

And a very pretty "arrangement" it was for a Deacon of the Presbyterian Church to enter into! The *Journal of Commerce* yesterday gave Netherland a very thick coat of the purest orthodox whitewash. What do the immaculate conductors of that saintly sheet think of a Deacon who enters into an "arrangement" with a trader in negroes, to tell lies to a simple boy, and thus plays off to betray the confidence which has been reposed in him? This little confession settles Netherland in our estimation. We should not feel offended to believe him although he made oath to the truth of his narrative.

In paying his personal compliments to *The Tribune*, near the close of his production, the Deacon says: "I have never whipped a grown negro in my life, though I have scared them ever since I owned property." Pray, is it the custom of Southern gentlemen to do their own flogging? We thought that it was rather the practice to keep a skilful professional flogger in pay, or to detail one or two of the stoutest slaves for the purpose, so that the Deacon's brag that he never whipped a grown negro in his life does not, after all, seem to amount to much. He hires it done. He deputes wandering slave-traders to do it, as upon this occasion. Daily exercises himself now and then upon the pickaninnies.

THE TRACT SOCIETY.—Some of the ultra pro-slavery papers at the South are by no means soothed by the recent movement of the American Tract Society. The (Richmond) *South* publication of tracts would be a mere trick to "coax the South out of professes to treat it as a mere trick to "coax the South out of its sulky humour," and hopes the overtures will be rejected.—*Daily Times.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE!

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1857.

BOANERGES BROWNLOW.

We shall not ask our courteous readers to cast their eyes over the letter of the Rev. W. G. Brownlow, editor of the *Knoxville Whig*, better known perhaps as the Fighting Parson, which he has done us the honour to address to us—for we know them too well to believe that they could help themselves if they tried. They would not be worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called to be the readers of so excellent n paper as THE STANDARD, if their healthy appetites did not at once instinctively urge them to so savoury a morsel as this which we serve up to them to-day. We commend particularly to their notice the high character given to our modest sheet by this discriminating and most competent critic at the opening of his epistle, as we are confident that if anything could increase their regard and esteem for it, it would be the sense which our Reverend contemporary has of its wants. It is precisely the praise which we have always been our ambition to have in the months of all slaveholding Churches and ministers, and we shall account it no other of the many seals which we substantiate the genuineness of our apostleship. We trust that we are not accustomed to think more highly of ourselves than we ought to think; but if anything could throw us off our balance, it would be such a testimony to the excellence of the work we have turned out as so competent a witness—an "expert," as it is called in law—here bears in pronouncing it "the most *infinitely infernal* production" he ever saw, and in attributing its origin to the dominions of darkness, and its fellowship to the Devil and his angels.

Our Reverend Correspondent will also be pleased to accept our congratulations on the diligence with which he hath given himself to the study of the doctrine, and the improvements thereupon, which he found in the number of THE STANDARD which has extorted from him this cordial commendation of the temper, spirit and thoroughness with which we have delivered the gospel committed unto us. He has "perused the paper through, editorials, notices and advertisements," and we will venture to say that he never had a more edifying lecture in his life. We should fear not to affirm that he has not seen so much truth in the same space since he was called to the ministry of saving souls and torturing bodies in Tennessee. For it was this Christian minister, some of our readers may be aware, who lately said that, if he could have had his way, a certain slave, who was burned in his neighbourhood by Lynch law, should have been torn limb from limb alive, and his flesh torn off with red-hot pincers. This was in a recent letter from our Reverend Epistler to the *Daily Times* of this city, *apropos* to some strictures on the little eccentricity of Col. Netherland towards his negro which was the occasion of this letter to us. We should judge from this taste of his quality, thus furnished by himself, that he is entirely competent to pass without appeal on the infernal nature of any productions whatsoever, and also to speak as one having authority of the dominions of darkness and of the fellowship of the Devil and his angels. We may possibly doubt his accuracy in regard to our own genesis, but there can be no question, after this, as to his general competency as a witness in regard to such matters.

We have not room to go into any extended *exegesis* on this Epistle. We would merely draw the attention of Northern Christians, and especially those of the Methodist order, to the pattern of Christianity, good manners and the English language, that they will find written down therein. This is the sort of Christian minister, scholar and gentleman that slavery makes out of material, which, it is barely possible, might have been worked up into a divine of the fair Northern average, had he been placed in favourable surroundings. He might have been educated up to the level of common humanity, of an ordinary comprehension of the canons of Biblical interpretation, and even to a grammatical use of the English tongue. We admit that it requires a good deal more faith than a grain of mustard-seed to perceive the possibility of such very violent probabilities; but we Abolitionists are eminently a believing generation, in spite of all our enemies say of our infidelity, and we can swallow almost anything that is unlikely. His example should have the effect of making all Northern ministers, who know a cruel action when they see it, who have been taught how to extract wisdom and purity out of the Scriptures instead of drivelling blasphemy against God and Man, and who can write English such as a school-boy need not be ashamed of, grateful for the mercy which has cast their lines in latitudes farther from the Equator. They might have been even as this clerical bruiser, coarse, brutal, and illiterate, had they been born in those barbarous regions where the Gospel of Slavery is preached by such Apostles as this.

But the Rev. Editor, it seems, is resolved to be even with us. Manifold as have been the offences of the North and of the Abolitionists in particular, our punishment is at hand, and, if inevitable, we fear may be greater than we can bear. Our readers, we are sure, will read with horror and amazement the doom which this implacable Inquisitor proposes to visit upon us for our sins. He is preparing to come down on us, like a wolf in the fold, clad in four times quadruple mail. A minister with only five or six heads to his discourse is generally regarded with terror, in these days of small things and short sermons, and the trembling hearer hopes in his secret soul that the next division any one announced as "lastly" or "to conclude." What wide-spread consternation, then, must a Reverend divine scatter throughout a country, who approaches the people with a Discourse with Sixteen Heads? A very Hydra of a Homily! What Hercules have we equal to this adventure? And eight hours long! We shudder at the bare idea—and dread to think what treachery we might be tempted to be guilty of towards the slave, if duty to him compelled us to incur this horror. It was fair and above-board, we allow, on his part, to give us fair warning of what we have to expect. We may, if our hearts should still fail us, fly away and hide ourselves, as men did before the face of William Gilmore Simms, LL. D., when he threatened last winter to overwhelm them with the mountain weight of his stupidities.

There is one thing very noteworthy about this projected missionary visit of our pro-slavery propagandist, and that is, that he has no doubt of civil treatment and a fair chance of being heard. And, of course, he will get both. Nobody will think of getting up mobs to drive him away or to put him down. If he can persuade people to go and hear him and can sample a crowd, he has given them of what they are to expect, he will have no interruption or disturbance. He is entirely free to persuade the labouring people of the free States that the negroes are much better off than they, and that they had better subside into the happy condition of careless chattelism without delay. He may convince our capitalists and landholders, if he can, that it would be much better for them to adopt that system of labour which has so much increased the value of land in the slave States over what it can reach in the free. He may overturn our institutions, if he have the skill, and have never a coat of tar and feathers offered for his wearing or an extemporized halter thrown over a branch for his repose. But how is it with his own vicinage? He is very ready, he says, to meet Mr. Theodore Parker or Mr. Ward Beecher in debate. But can those gentlemen go to Knoxville to hold it? Can any of the "*pious rascals*" or "*ragabond philanthropists*" whom he thirsts to meet in single combat come? Why, go towards the South to pick up his gauntlet, and hold the tournament there, and have safe-conduct to go and come? Of course, our ordained Champion would be one of the first to fall by them to death. And why, if slavery be indeed the corner-stone of God at the very foundation of the world, and blest by him ever since, can it be endangered by the assaults of such enemies? Is the arm of God shortened that he cannot protect his own? This simple fact is a two-edged sword to smite off all the sixteen heads of the monster he proposes to set loose to devour us.

We do not believe that either Mr. Parker or Mr. Beecher will meet this doughty Son of Thunder in the field of debate. To do so, would be to admit that he had an inch of ground to stand upon—which would be to blaspheme Religion, insult Reason and outrage Common Sense. A man who deliberately proposes as a thesis to be defended logically and theologically, that God made one part of his children to be the absolute property of another part, with all the incidents of property, is not worthy of a serious antagonism. "He is not fit to hear himself convinced." The proposition is an insult to the human understanding and the human heart. Slavery is not a logical or a mathematical question. It can neither be set up or overthrown by reasoning or demonstration. It is a matter of first principles, of axioms, of self-evident propositions. All that is necessary to overthrow all the fallacies and lies in which it takes refuge is the simple statement of universal truths and an appeal to the simplest instincts of human nature. "Would you choose to be a slave yourself?" is a formula of power to overthrow all the sophistries that theologians or politicians ever spun out of the letter of the Bible or the fictions of the law. But though we cannot promise Mr. Brownlow Anti-Slavery foemen worthy of his steel, we will tell him what we should be willing to try and get for him. We should like to see him pitted against a Mormon Elder, and we will back this last (or would were we of the sporting world), that he will establish the Divine Origin, the Messianic permission, the Apostolic sanction and the general advantages of Polygamy, at every point of his sixteen divisions, by arguments every whit as cogent and by examples every jot as authoritative as Mr. Brownlow can bring in defence of American Slavery. If he will consent to this substitution, we will do our best to provide him with an antagonist, and we think we could even engage to secure him an audience.

We have said nothing about Colonel Netherland's defence of himself, because we have treated of that matter in another place. Mr. Brownlow is entirely in error as to our mode of carrying on the Anti-Slavery cause. We should conceal from our readers anything so pat to our purpose as his own letter or that of his lay friend. But we thought that common courtesy, of which our Correspondent has set us so signal an example, demanded that we should give the shepherd his due precedence over the sheep.

CALL FOR A NORTHERN CONVENTION.

Whereas it must be obvious to all that the American Union is constantly becoming more and more divided, by Slavery, into two distinct and antagonistic nations, whose mutual harmony is impossible, and even ordinary intercourse is becoming dangerous;

And whereas Slavery has now gained entire control over the three branches of our National Government, Executive, Judicial and Legislative; has so interpreted the Constitution as to deny the right of Congress to establish freedom even in the Territories, and by the same process has removed all legal protection from a large portion of the people of the free States, and has inflicted, in many instances, far greater wrongs than those which our fathers rose in arms to repel;

And whereas there seems no probability that the future will, in these respects, be different from the past, under existing State relations;

The undersigned respectfully invite their fellow-citizens of the Free States to meet in Convention, at Cleveland, Ohio, on WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, October 28th and 29th, 1857, to consider the practicability, probability and expediency of a separation of the Free and Slave States, and to take such other measures as the condition of the times may require.

Maine.
John R. Banton,
William Cushman,
J. B. Drew,
John Hanscom,
S. S. Peterson,
Peter Libbey,
Isaac J. Merrill,
Peter L. Morrill,
John Wheeler,
M. F. Whittier.

New Hampshire.
A. Bronson Alcott,
Alonzo Allen,
Benjamin Chase,
Jabez Chuliis,
Nathaniel White.

Vermont.
Alonzo Blair,
T. S. Bliss,
W. H. H. Claflin,
John Gillies,
William Hayward,
N. E. Johnson,
Cromwell Leonard,
Chauncey Richardson,
Joshua Ross,
S. M. Seward.

Massachusetts.
William I Bowditch,
Amos Dresser,
Chauncey Clark,
C. H. Codman,
Elnathan Dill,
Thomas Earle,
Nathaniel Hall,
Charles F. Hovey,
John F. Jewett,
Frank B. Sanborn.

Rhode Island.
J. C. Brown,
Samuel B. Chase,
John Helme Clarke,
Dutty Evans,
Asa Fairbanks,
D. B. Harris,
T. M. Hathaway,
A. R. Jones,
A. Parmenter,
J. Towne.

Connecticut.
J. B. Barnes,
Eldy Harding,
J. C. Hebard,
Merrill Humphrey,
A. Pettibone,
Philip Scarborough,
Riley Stillman,
Geo. W. Walbridge,
J. B. Whitcomb,
J. D. Wright.

New York.
James A. Burr,
William Henry Burr,
J. F. Cleveland,
S. H. Gay,
H. W. Gilbert,
O. Johnson,
S. J. May,
Isaac Post,
Robert Owen,
L. Wetmore.

New Jersey.
A. G. Campbell,
William Cubbs,
J. B. Grimes,
J. P. Hutchinson,
Samuel R. Jones,
Rowland Johnson,
Seth H. Leap,
Benjamin Rulon,
Thomas B. Thorn,
Philip Woolton.

Pennsylvania.
Caleb C. Hood,
W. W. Justice,
Edward Parsmor,
J. M. McKim,
Robert Purvis,
John Tillinghast,
W. W. Walker,
Charles F. Walton,
John Weiner,
Thomas Whitson.

Ohio.
Abraham Brooke,
John DeGraw,
Joseph Heighton,
Robert Hitler,
Chester Nash,
William F. Parker,
F. J. Stevens,
M. R. Robinson,
Zaphna Sione,
Joshua Wilsery.

Michigan.
J. Carroll,
Edward Y. Cornell,
John Dye,
Barton Durfee,
F. G. Hooker,
R. W. Kennedy,
A. L. Power,
L. B. Russell,
W. Weeks,
J. H. Woods.

Indiana.
A. H. Buckman,
I. M. Frost,
William Hayward,
John Hiatt,
John Jay,
Harris Jennees,
Lemuel S. Jones,
Thomas H. Kore,
T. T. Puckett,
John M. Thornburgh.

Illinois.
Moses Bishop,
C. B. Campbell,
A. J. Grove,
T. C. Haywood,
A. S. Hoadley,
F. Hoover,
John Phinny,
A. R. Reneli,
John S. Stafford,
B. G. Wrigh.

Wisconsin.
Alfred Aspball,
Benjamin Billard,
Lyman Bowles,
Joseph Doolttle,
N. W. Marth,
D. H. Morgan,
W. S. Osborn,
E. D. Phelps
Gilbert S. Sicel,
J. M. Whitcher.

Iowa.
Elijah Bushby,
Henry B. Clarke,
J. P. Davis,
O. Hambleton,
W. H. Hanna,
Lot Holmes,
Edwin James,
Benjamin D. Pierce,
Edward Tuttle,
Cromwell Wilson.

Minnesota.
Benj. B. Beall,
A. E. Bemis,
N. M. Bemis,
O. G. Blakesee,
Henry Blakeslee,
H. M. Blakesee,
J. Mortimer Jall,
P. Sherman,
Otis R. Spur,
J. M. Vining.

NOTE. The unexpectedly large number of signatures to this call renders it impossible to print more than a few names from each State. An analysis of the whole list is given below. It is evident that by more systematic effort the number might have been increased ten-fold. As it is, however, it is not known that any convention in the United States was ever summoned by so large a number of persons.

Committee of Arrangements.

THOS. WENTWORTH HIGGINSON, WENDELL PHILLIPS,
F. W. BIRD, SAMUEL MAY,
WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.
JOSEPH A. HOWLAND, *Secretary.*

State.	*Legal Voters.*	*Others.*	*State.*	*Legal Voters.*	*Others.*
Maine,	33	22	Ohio,	1,15;	570
New Hampshire,	56	29	Michigan,	31;	131
Vermont,	39	1	Indiana,	351	123
Massachusetts,	945	380	Illinois,	124	46
Rhode Island,	79	24	Wisconsin,	87	32
Connecticut,	63	40	Iowa,	136	45
New York,	509.	253	Minnesota,	5	4
New Jersey,	21	12	Others,	7	4
Pennsylvania,	227	109			
Total, . . .	6,033 persons.			4,200	1,833

THE ANNUAL ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR at Worcester was held in that city last week, a valuable and beautiful collection of goods and articles—and the devotion and friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society—being chibited in BERNLEY HALL. Owing to the almost panistricken condition of the people of Worcester and neighbouring towns, by reason of the disturbed state of business and the many failures of individuals and corporations, the receipts of the Fair will be somewhat reduced from the average of former years. But its friends have the satisfaction of feeling that their efforts will has added a handsome sum to the treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

Several other public shows and Fairs were held in Worcester during the week, but it was said that the ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR was the only one that so much paid its expenses.

COLONEL NETHERLAND'S DEFENCE.

We give place this week to the statement of Colonel Netherland, of Rogersville, Tenn., in reply to the charges of cruelty to slaves, brought against him by the Rev. Samuel Sawyer, whose Statement was published in THE STANDARD of Aug. 29th. We also insert with equal promptness, and in a conspicuous place, a letter addressed to us by the Rev. W. G. Brownlow, editor of the Knoxville (Tenn.) *Whig*, and devoted in part to a defence of Col. Netherland. Both of these letters we commend to the careful and candid attention of our readers. Mr. Brownlow asks, "Will you have the magnanimity to publish it?" (Col. Netherland's reply?) We answer, that we publish it for the reason on its face the evidence of truth, and if published by you, must insure the swift demolition of all the falsehoods you have paraded before your readers on that subject, even among the most bigoted of your abolition readers." It is natural that an editor in Tennessee, where ...lom of speech and freedom of the press in opposition to slavery is suppressed by the terrors of the Lynch code, and where every avenue through which a knowledge of the true principles and purposes of the Abolitionists might be expected in reach the minds of the Southern people is guarded with a jealousy more watchful and menacing than that whereby the crowned despots of the Old World preserve their subjects from the contaminating influence of Republican ideas, should doubt the willingness of the anti-slavery press to allow a slaveholder a fair opportunity of speaking for himself. That Mr. Brownlow should anticipate no other part the same anxiety to conceal from our readers the defence of Col. Netherland that the Colonel himself and his friends exhibited for the suppression of Mr. Sawyer's Statement—an anxiety which in their case found vent in threats of prosecution against the printers, causing them in their alarm in destroy eleven-twelfths of the edition and to attempt to destroy the rest—is only another illustration of the common maxim that men instinctively judge others by themselves. The judgment in this case, as Mr. Brownlow must admit, is utterly at fault, since we announced last week our purpose to print Col. Netherland's communication, and actually had it in type before Mr. B.'s letter was received. We trust that Mr. B., after reading this article, will duly appreciate not only our "magnanimity," but our courage, in volunteering to publish a statement which, according to him, "must insure the swift demolition" of all that is precious to our eyes.

Col. Netherland appears as a witness in his own case, and if we may not fairly set aside his testimony, so far as it is intended to exculpate himself, as wholly unworthy of confidence, we may at least reasonably assume that he has put in the strongest possible light every mitigating circumstance, and that Mr. Sawyer's narrative, even if erroneous in some respects, is CERTAINLY TRUE IN ALL THOSE PARTICULARS IN WHICH HE (Col. N.) HAS NOW CONTRADICT IT. We propose, therefore, to compare the Statement of Col. N. with that of Mr. Sawyer, with a view to discover how far they contradict and how far they agree with each other, and thus to determine the value of the Colonel's defence.

The cruelties described by Mr. Sawyer were alleged to have been inflicted upon two slaves, named *Abe* and *Anthony*. Let us consider the case of each by itself.

CASE OF THE SLAVE *ABE*.

The case is thus stated by Mr. Sawyer:

"The negro had been sold to be sent to Mississippi, which would be separated from his wife and children, with no prospect of seeing them again, he escaped to the woods and lay hid for more than a year. He was found by some hunters, brought in and delivered to the owner." "The church-member (Col. Netherland) agreed that he should be openly and publicly whipped. *With his chains on, he was taken by the constable to the master's house, to a field just back of the church, where he was whipped naked, tied to four stakeds, each arm and each foot tied to a sapling, blindfolded, so that he could not see when the blows were coming, and placed on the earth.* It was then proposed to put the yoke or a two-tined fork over his neck to finish this Mississippi scene. A bystander, from motives of humanity, spread his clothes under the stooping boy, to shield him from the rocks and brier bare ground. A leather strap had been nailed to a wood bundle for the occasion. Thus far there had been various speculations. The whipper now requested a position at a distance off, as they wanted to get some confession from the boy ns to who harboured him, &c. They retired a little distance, but where they could still hear the blows; and witness the cruelty of the negro's cries." "The whipping commenced. It was currently reported in the community that it was administered by a man too often under the influence of intoxicating drink, and that fearfully became the negro had escaped him once before, and with profane words—that the negro cried for mercy—that he whipped on till he gave him THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY odd blows, and would probably have given him more had not the nails come loose from the strap. All this, too, was publicly witnessed by a number of prominent citizens and a number of the College students. Some counted the blows and wailed about two hours while this strap were over, then went up and looked at the body and the bloody strap with the nails in it, and heard the whipper, sick at heart, turned away from the revolting scene and went to their homes."

In reply to this circumstantial narrative, in the publication of which Mr. Sawyer braved the hostility of every slaveholder and slave-trader in the vicinity, and exposed himself to the vengeance of they Lynchers, what has Col. Netherland to offer? Let the reader turn to the first page and see for himself. In the first place, he tells us that the negro was a man of immoral and desperate character, which might be admitted to be true without invalidating one of Mr. Sawyer's statements. He was sold, it is said, for "drunkenness, gambling and laziness"—faults which, if he was guilty of them, he not improbably contracted from the most mercenary exactly all around him—fraud, gambling and lazy white men. "He had taken up," says Col. N., in the language of the plantation, "with a free mulatto prostitute." In a community where the virtue of no coloured woman is safe from the forceful assaults of lecherous white men, it is hardly to be expected that a slave's standard of female virtue should be very high, but the testimony of this accused slaveholder as to the character of poor Abe's wife should be received with caution, since he is under every temptation to be unfair if not to be false. It is for the interest of every slaveholder that his "boys" should "take up" with *slave* wives; and it is by no means unlikely that Abe was sold less for the faults named than because, being unwilling to become the father of slaves, he chose a *free* woman for his companion. Mr. Sawyer says he escaped to the woods on account of his attachment to his wife and children; and while there is nothing in Col. N.'s statement inconsistent with this allegation, it would naturally be a confirmation from the revengeful feelings he exhibited towards the man who discovered that she had "taken up" with another. The reader must judge for himself how much credit should be given to Col. Netherland's statements as to the character of this poor negro, who cannot speak for himself; and it is only fair to give the latter the benefit of such inferences in his favour as may be legitimately drawn from admitted facts. He certainly had the sympathy and good-will of his fellow-slaves, or they would have shrunk from the vengeance of their masters by aiding him in his escape. What must be the character of slavery, when its victims hide themselves in dens and caves of the earth, live for years upon the scanty provisions stealthily conveyed to them by their fellow-slaves, and consent to be hunted as outlaws, rather than submit to its dreadful conditions: And what must be the state of society where immortal children of God, for the crime of loving their slaves, and to be separated forever from their families, are pursued like wild beasts and exposed to be shot by any white scoundrel who can carry a gun?

Waiving, however, all question as to the character of the slave, let us see what Col. Netherland admits and denies as to the flogging. He admits that it was administered *by his advice*, but asserts that it "*was not equal in severity to 39 lashes with a cowhide.*" Mark his words! He does not deny that the number of the blows (THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY odd) was correctly stated by Mr. Sawyer, but only affirms that they *did "not equal in severity 39 lashes with a cowhide"!* This statement he asks us to believe on his own authority alone, though he admits that he was three miles away when the flogging was administered, and although we have the testimony of Mr. Sawyer, confirmed by that of two Elders of the Church, that the revolting scene "was witnessed by a number of the citizens and a number of the College students," whose ears, for the space of two hours, were saluted by the poor negro's piteous cries for mercy, mingled with the oaths of the scoundrel whom Mr. Blevins and the pious Col. N. employed as the executioner of their vengeance; that some of the spectators "counted the blows" and afterwards looked at the bound and prostrate body and the bloody instrument of torture, while "others, sick at heart, turned away from the revolting scene and returned to their homes." Not one of the cruel details of the flogging, as related by Mr. Sawyer, does Col. N. venture to deny, except the allegation that the victim was blindfolded. In every other specification—the leading of the chained victim by the parsonage to the field in the rear of the church, the shameful denudation, the lashing to the sapling, the kindness of the bystander in spreading his clothes under his stomach to keep him from the rocks and the bare ground—all these circumstances, not to deny denied, we may assume as admitted to be true. And of all this the pious Col. Netherland says, "I APPROVE OF IT FULLY." Those who know enough of slavery to understand the feelings of the master toward a slave who has run away can judge for themselves whether it is likely that poor Abe was chained, stripped naked and tied in the manner described merely for the purpose of a *light* punishment! "*I told him* (Mr. Blevins) *that he ought to punish him for his villanies.*" Look at the catalogue of "villanies" which Col. N. attributes to Abe, and judge whether it is probable that "the object was to frighten more than to hurt him."

THE CASE OF ANTHONY.

Mr. Sawyer's account of this case we must here repeat. If our readers ask why we again call their attention to such a tale of revolting cruelty, we must remind them that, in pleading the cause of the outraged slaves, it will not do to relax the demands of justice and disobey the voice of conscience in deference to the weakness of our nerves. If we would help the slaves, we must not stop our ears to their cry of anguish. Though you shudder with indignation and horror, read on:

"The same Church-member (Col. N.) had taken an old gray-headed servant, that had helped nurse him in childhood, and, on mere suspicion, it was said, that he knew where a large blisters and bursts them, cutting the hide in pieces; that he whipped him ON SOUND, whipped him till the neighbours closed their doors and windows and declared they could not sustain themselves to keep from hearing the blows and the negro's cries for mercy—whipped him till the women of the place cried out against it—whipped him till the sound of his feet in the stirrup, as he mounted his horse, could be heard from the Court—till the landlord, after he had given him, as he supposed, at least HUNDRED BLOWS with the saw, refused to whip him any more, and he must go and do it himself, although the owner had agreed to pay him for his being whipped there, taking advantage of the absence of the jailer he took three sticks from a loom and whipped him over the raw flesh, to prevent the skin from being torn by many he did not know, and of course could not tell, and that in this respect the testimony of the servants corresponded; that, not satisfied with the confessions, he drove out word that he would whip him again the next day; that the jailer resolved to prevent the jail being used any more for such a purpose, and the inspectors instructed him not to suffer it; and that many of these particulars of the whipping the trader himself acknowledged in the statements he made to various individuals. After remaining at Rutledge *nearly a week to heal up his flesh*, they proceeded with servant, on *Sabbath evening* after the whipping of the runaway, returned home. The brutal trader stripped him the next day, tied him up in the jail yard, although the sheriff and jailer were both opposed to *that he could not see when the blows were coming, and placed on the earth.* It was then proposed to put the yoke or a two-tined fork over his neck to finish this Mississippi scene. A bystander, from motives of humanity, spread his clothes under the stooping boy, to shield him from the rocks and brier bare ground. A leather strap had been nailed to a wood bundle for the occasion. Thus far there had been various speculations. The whipper now requested a position at a distance off, as they wanted to get some confession from the boy ns to who harboured him, &c. They retired a little distance, but where they could still hear the blows; and witness the cruelty of the negro's cries." "The whipping commenced. It was currently reported in the community that it was administered by a man too often under the influence of intoxicating drink, and that fearfully became the negro had escaped him once before, and with profane words—that the negro cried for mercy—that he whipped on till he gave him THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY odd blows, and would probably have given him more had not the nails come loose from the strap. All this, too, was publicly witnessed by a number of prominent citizens and a number of the College students. Some counted the blows and wailed about two hours while this strap were over, then went up and looked at the body and the bloody strap with the nails in it, and heard the whipper, sick at heart, turned away from the revolting scene and went to their homes."

In reply to this circumstantial narrative, in the publication of which Mr. Sawyer braved the hostility of every slaveholder and slave-trader in the vicinity, and exposed himself to the vengeance of they Lynchers, what has Col. Netherland to offer? Let the reader turn to the first page and see for himself. In the first place, he tells us that the negro was a man of immoral and desperate character, which might be admitted to be true without invalidating one of Mr. Sawyer's statements. He was sold, it is said, for "drunkenness, gambling and laziness"—faults which, if he was guilty of them, he not improbably contracted from the most mercenary exactly all around him—fraud, gambling and lazy white men. "He had taken up," says Col. N., in the language of the plantation, "with a free mulatto prostitute." In a community where the virtue of no coloured woman is safe from the forceful assaults of lecherous white men, it is hardly to be expected that a slave's standard of female virtue should be very high, but the testimony of this accused slaveholder as to the character of poor Abe's wife should be received with caution, since he is under every temptation to be unfair if not to be false. It is for the interest of every slaveholder that his "boys" should "take up" with *slave* wives; and it is by no means unlikely that Abe was sold less for the faults named than because, being unwilling to become the father of slaves, he chose a *free* woman for his companion. Mr. Sawyer says he escaped to the woods on account of his attachment to his wife and children; and while there is nothing in Col. N.'s statement inconsistent with this allegation, it would naturally be a confirmation from the revengeful feelings he exhibited towards the man who discovered that she had "taken up" with another. The reader must judge for himself how much credit should be given to Col. Netherland's statements as to the character of this poor negro, who cannot speak for himself; and it is only fair to give the latter the benefit of such inferences in his favour as may be legitimately drawn from admitted facts. He certainly had the sympathy and good-will of his fellow-slaves, or they would have shrunk from the vengeance of their masters by aiding him in his escape. What must be the character of slavery, when its victims hide themselves in dens and caves of the earth, live for years upon the scanty provisions stealthily conveyed to them by their fellow-slaves, and consent to be hunted as outlaws, rather than submit to its dreadful conditions: And what must be the state of society where immortal children of God, for the crime of loving their slaves, and to be separated forever from their families, are pursued like wild beasts and exposed to be shot by any white scoundrel who can carry a gun?

Waiving, however, all question as to the character of the slave, let us see what Col. Netherland admits and denies as to the flogging. He admits that it was administered *by his advice*, but asserts that it "*was not equal in severity to 39 lashes with a cowhide.*" Mark his words! He does not deny that the number of the blows (THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY odd) was correctly stated by Mr. Sawyer, but only affirms that they *did "not equal in severity 39 lashes with a cowhide"!* This statement he asks us to believe on his own authority alone, though he admits that he was three miles away when the flogging was administered, and although we have the testimony of Mr. Sawyer, confirmed by that of two Elders of the Church, that the revolting scene "was witnessed by a number of the citizens and a number of the College students," whose ears, for the space of two hours, were saluted by the poor negro's piteous cries for mercy, mingled with the oaths of the scoundrel whom Mr. Blevins and the pious Col. N. employed as the executioner of their vengeance; that some of the spectators "counted the blows" and afterwards looked at the bound and prostrate body and the bloody instrument of torture, while "others, sick at heart, turned away from the revolting scene and returned to their homes." Not one of the cruel details of the flogging, as related by Mr. Sawyer, does Col. N. venture to deny, except the allegation that the victim was blindfolded. In every other specification—the leading of the chained victim by the parsonage to the field in the rear of the church, the shameful denudation, the lashing to the sapling, the kindness of the bystander in spreading his clothes under his stomach to keep him from the rocks and the bare

"*DIABOLICAL CRUELTY TO SLAVES, OR SOUTHERN CHRISTIANITY ILLUSTRATED.*"

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SIR: I have your issue for August 29th before me. A large weekly sheet, published by the "American Anti-Slavery Society," in New York and by the "Right Book Association of its "reign." I have perused the paper through, and can find, in its editorials, selections, and contributed matter, the most *infinitely infernal* production I have ever perused. Words are too poor to express my abhorrence of the spirit of the paper, its editor, publishers and patrons. It must be classed in the dominions of darkness, and its fellowship with the Devil and his angels! Any man who would consent to write a smaller offence to engage in supporting a plague from the East,

We continue to receive the most cheerful accounts from the agents who are making the tour of the Western States. Mr. Pillsbury, in a letter just received, thus speaks in general terms of the campaign:

"So far, our Western operations appear to prosper. We have never had larger, more interesting or successful gatherings since my connection with the cause began.

"We cannot answer nearly all the calls made upon us for lectures in Ohio, to say nothing of States further west, even beyond the Mississippi. I often sigh for the health and vigour of former years.

"If our political lookers-on, who have so often stigmatized us as the '*Do-Nothing party*,' would some of them come with us one month, we would show them what is meant, in apostolic parlance, by '*instant in season and out of season*.'

"Nor did we ever labour with better effect than at present. The Western Anniversary was certainly one of the best ever held. And the key-note then struck is the tone of nearly all our meetings since. At Marlboro' and New Lisbon, the Remonds did themselves great honour, and the cause most essential service. Then they came to New Brighton, and began a series of evening lectures to excellent audiences, who heard with deep attention.

"Meanwhile, Mr. Foss and myself made a very encouraging visit to Canfield, the county seat, and found slavery *incorporated into every department of society*, and in the adoption of rules for the government of the Church, they wisely and justly provided members of the Church, they wisely and justly provided for the right of *owners* and the wants of the *slave!*

"Since then, Mr. Foss, and myself have made a very encouraging visit to Canfield, the county seat, and found slavery *incorporated into every department of society*, and in the adoption of rules for the government of the Church, they wisely and justly provided members of the Church, they wisely and justly provided for the right of *owners* and the wants of the *slave!*

Eleventh—Slavery, in the age of the Apostles, had so spectacular society, and was so intimately interwoven with the Church, the Apostles and first teachers of Christianity in it, just as it is in these Southern States, that a *religion preaching freedom to the slave* would have arrayed against it the civil authorities, armed against itself the whole power of the State, and declared the unlawfulness of its preachers. St. Paul knew this—and did not assail the institution of slavery—justified its existence, and laboured to get both *masters and slaves* to Heaven, as all well-informed and treebearted ministers are now doing!

Twelfth—Slavery having existed ever since the first organization of society, and of the Church, the Scriptures clearly teach that it will exist to the end of time. Revelations vi, 12–17, points to it as "The Day of Judgment," or "The Last Day." "The Great Day," and the condition of the human race at that time, as well as the *classes* of persons to be judged, rewarded and punished. A portion of this impressive and significant text reads, "and the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every BONDMAN, and every FREEMAN," will be there, evidently teaching that slavery will exist, and that the relations of *master and slave* will be recognized, at the end of time.

Thirteenth—Neither the *politicians* nor *divines* at the North can be relied on confidence who are engaged in the villainous agitation of the slavery question. They are exciting the whole country, and framing society into a livid, consuming flame, while they have no sympathies for the black man, and care nothing for his comfort. President Pierce had thirty-five hundred New England parsons after him at one time, "in the name of Almighty God." Franklin Pierce had thirty-five hundred New England parsons after him, and Buchanan has forty Connecticut parsons after him, the old Granite State number, according to the *forty bulls of Basham*, threatening him with "terrible majesty," if he shall fail to make Kansas free.

"Oh for a forty-Parson power,
To sing thy praise, hypocrisy!"

Fourteenth—I know from personal observation among the free negroes at the North that they are more wholesale and destitute, as a whole, than the slave population of the South. Their freedom is only an empty name; and even the pleasures of life are denied the free negroes of the North by poor hollow-hearted and hypocritical citizens, full of sympathy for the down-trodden African!

Fifteenth—African slaves were first imported into America in 1620, a century after their introduction into the West Indies. The *second* cargo landed on our shores landed in Boston, and for years the *prime* New England slaves kept up the supply, and but few slaves among themselves, because it was not profitable to use negro labour in those cold and sterile regions. The people of New England were never, to a great extent, *slaveholding*; their virtuous and pious minds were chiefly exercised in *slave-stealing* and *slave-selling*. They stole the African from his native land, and sold him into bondage for the sake of gain. To New England the blush is indebted for the system of slavery, when the New England States abolished slavery, they brought their negroes to the South and sold them before their laws could go into effect. And what few ships are in the slave trade now, at the peril of *piracy*, are New England ships!

Sixteenth—The cities and towns of the New England States now open a wider and more inviting field for faithful missionary labours than Hindoostan, Siam, Ceylon, or the western coast of Africa. New England is the *nursery* of all the dangerous and disorganizing doctrines, moral, social and political, which now threaten the overthrow of virtue and truth in the Union. As a people, they have forsaken the true God, and gone after "strange Gods." There is *Fourierism*, with its train of levelling precepts and degrading purposes; next comes *Free-love-ism*, that moral leper, striking at the very foundation of domestic virtue; next in order of "progressive ideas," with the New England States abolished slavery, they brought their negroes to the South and sold them before their laws could go into effect. And what few ships are in the slave trade now, at the peril of *piracy*, are New England ships!

Seventeenth—The cities and towns of the New England States now open a wider and more inviting field for faithful missionary labours than Hindoostan, Siam, Ceylon, or the western coast of Africa. New England is the *nursery* of all the dangerous and disorganizing doctrines, moral, social and political, which now threaten the overthrow of virtue and truth in the Union. As a people, they have forsaken the true God, and gone after "strange Gods." There is *Fourierism*, with its train of levelling precepts and degrading purposes; next comes *Free-love-ism*, that moral leper, striking at the very foundation of domestic virtue; next in order of "progressive ideas," with the New England States abolished slavery, they brought their negroes to the South and sold them before their laws could go into effect. And what few ships are in the slave trade now, at the peril of *piracy*, are New England ships!

Eighteenth—The cities and towns of the New England States now open a wider and more inviting field for faithful missionary labours than Hindoostan, Siam, Ceylon, or the western coast of Africa. New England is the *nursery* of all the dangerous and disorganizing doctrines, moral, social and political, which now threaten the overthrow of virtue and truth in the Union. As a people, they have forsaken the true God, and gone after "strange Gods." There is *Fourierism*, with its train of levelling precepts and degrading purposes; next comes *Free-love-ism*, that moral leper, striking at the very foundation of domestic virtue; next in order of "progressive ideas," with the New England States abolished slavery, they brought their negroes to the South and sold them before their laws could go into effect. And what few ships are in the slave trade now, at the peril of *piracy*, are New England ships!

Nineteenth—The Christian Church, in the Apostolic age, not only admitted the existence of slavery, but in various ways, by her teachings and discipline, expressed *or sanctified approbation* of it, enforcing the observance of the "Fugitive Slave Law," that had been enacted by the State. And, in the various acts of the Church, from the days of the active labours of the Apostles, downward through several centuries, she enacted laws and adopted regulations touching the duties of *masters and slaves*, as such, which, in my humble judgment, amounts to a justification of the institution of slavery.

Twentieth—The Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments teach, certainly and conclusively, that God instituted the practice of men, women and children into bondage, and intended the relation of *master and slave* to exist through out the habitable world. Hence, when God, in his providence, opened the way for the organization of the Church, the Apostles and first teachers of Christianity found slavery *incorporated into every department of society*, and, in the adoption of rules for the government of the Church, they wisely and justly provided members of the Church, they wisely and justly provided for the right of *owners* and the wants of the *slave!*

Twenty-first—Slavery, in the age of the Apostles, had so spectacular society, and was so intimately interwoven with the civil authorities, armed against itself the whole power of the State, and declared the unlawfulness of its preachers. St. Paul knew this—and did not assail the institution of slavery—justified its existence, and laboured to get both *masters and slaves* to Heaven, as all well-informed and treebearted ministers are now doing!

*Twenty-second

Miscellaneous Department.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

TO THE HERMIT-THRUSH.

HERMIT-THRUSH! 'tis sweet to be
Out in the Summer-woods with thee—
Far in their depths, so green and still,
That rich thy tender music thrill,
Where a golden light through the maple gleams
In many-tinted emerald streams,
And nought is heard but the trembling grub
Of thy green-wood-mate, hermit-thrush!

And while the sun his mellowed beams
Pours down on the dim, Autumnal streams,
And the brown leaf, dry and sere,
Eddies down to the hazy mere,
Lying broad and deep and still,
Sullier than the lazy rill,
Whose blue waters quiet seem
Gliding on in a long day-dream,
And a low murmur, far and wide,
Tells of the slowly-coming tide,
When, the Indian Summer o'er,
The storms shall come with vast uproar,
Still, in suit of hermit-brown,
Thou lay'st in the hollow, down
Deep in the hins and quiet dells,
Careless whether the moser tells
Of thy music, or of thee,
Or thy life in the woodland-tree.

Hermit-thrush! amid the din
Of the city and its sin,
Thy very name, glad forest-child,
Cometh to me like a wood-note wild,
Bringing visions of the hills,
Bringing plashing of the rills,
And the sunshine's golden flash,
And the water's ceaseless dash—
And visions fair of the quiet glade,
Where the sick in spirit may be healed,
Where the thistle-finch, with plumes of gold,
Ebon-winged and ebon-polled,
Sitting on the thistle's crown,
Scatters far its silvery down,
Floating in the silent light,
And of sunny rambles where
I have found, in crevice lone,
Turned into enduring stone,
Feathery fern or antique shell!
That the tale of child-life tell
Or the chickweed's tiny flower,—
A snow-star shining its little hour;—
And I long again to be away,
Where I might list to thy tender lay,
And forget the moiling crowd,
With its tumult harsh and loud,
And the dirtier demagogue still toiling
'Mid the mob with all its moiling,
Where, each the mess of garbage earns,
Leading, each, and led, by turns,
And on soon at home with thee,
Singing at peace in thy wildwood-tree,
And while these sounds in the distance cease,
Encamp afar on the plains of peace.

September, 1857. H. W. C.

OUR OLD GRANDMOTHER.

"I FIND the marks of my shortest steps beside those of my beloved mother, which are surmounted by my own," says Alexander Dumas, and so conjures up one of the sweetest images in the world. He was revisiting the home of his infancy; he was retracing the little paths around it in which he had once walked; and strange flowers could not efface, and new roads could not conceal, and cruel ploughs could not obliterate his "shortest footsteps," and his mother's beside them, measured by his own.

And who needs to be told whose footsteps they were that thus kept time with the feeble pattering of childhood's little feet? It was no mother behind whom Ascanius walked "with unequal steps" in Virgil's line, but a strong, stern man, who could have borne him, and not been hurdened; folded him in his arms from all danger, and not been wearied; everything, indeed, he could have done for him, but just what he needed most—he could not sympathize with him—he could not be a child again.

Ah, a mere child is the mother herself! She can bid back the great old clock of time, and be a boy once more! Man's imagination can easily see the child a man; but how hard it is for it to see the man a child; and he who had learned to glide back into the days of infancy when he did not know that there were under the roses, or that clouds would ever return after the rain; when he thought a tear could stain a cheek no more than a drop of rain a flower; when he fancied that life had no disguise, and hope no blight at all—had yet to learn that the world can be discovering the north-west passage to Paradise.

And it is, perhaps, for this reason, that it is so much easier for a mother to enter the kingdom of Heaven than it is for the rest of the world. She has never to be leading the children, when, after all, the children are leading her, and they keep her indeed where the river is narrowest and air is the clearest; and the beckoning of the radiant hand is so plainly seen from the other side that it is no wonder she often fails to see the shadow upon the little finger she is holding, and goes over to the neighbours, and the children follow like lambs to the fold, for we think it ought somewhere to be written: "Where the mother is, there will the children be also."

But it was not of the mother we began to think, but of the dear, old-fashioned grandmother, whose thread of love, "by hand," on life's little wheel was longer and stronger than they make it now; whose wound and bound about the children she saw playing in the children's arms, in a true love knot, that nothing but the shears of Atropos could sever; for do we not recognise the lambs sometimes, when summer days are over, and snow-flakes are blowing, as they come lingering down the yellow fields, by the crimson thread we wound about their necks in April or May, and so undo the gate and let the wanderers in?

Blessed be the children who have an old-fashioned grandmother. As they hope for the one, let them love and honour her, for we can tell them they will never find another.

There is a large old kitchen somewhere in the past, and an old-fashioned fireplace therein, with its smooth old jambs on one—smooth with many knives that have been sharpened there—smooth with many little fingers that have clung there. There are andirons, too—the old andirons, with rings in the top, wherein many temples of flame have been builded, with the wood piled around and on, and the fire kindled, and the sacrifice of sleep and solace and